

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/087,786	03/05/2002	Hidekiyo Takaoka	M1071.1712	1545	
75	90 05/21/2004		EXAM	INER	
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY, LLP			IP, SIKYIN		
1177 Avenue of New York, NY	***************************************		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBE		
riew rork, ri	10030		1742		

DATE MAILED: 05/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			CA
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/087,786	TAKAOKA ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sikyin Ip	1742	_
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addre	ess
THE REPLY FILED 3/3/04;5/6/04 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to averal final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application application abandonment of this application abandment which	ation. A proper reply n places the applicati	to a ion in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire 1 ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF	g date of the final rejection HE FINAL REJECTION. \$ R 1.136(a) and the approp	n. See MPEP priate extension
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offictimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	originally set in the final C	Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sim	plifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims	
NOTE:			
$3. \boxtimes$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed a	mendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☑ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		dered but does NOT	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-15</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. \square The drawing correction filed on is a) \square app	roved or b)☐ disapproved by t	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). <u>@</u>	3/03/04.	
10. Other:		(-	
		SIKYIN PRIMARY EX	

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Exhibit fails to substantiate applicants' argument because the hard solders in said exhibit are not Sn base. Applicants' argument as set forth in page 6 of instant remarks is noted. But, the instant claims require Cr which has melting point about 900 C higher than Cu. Therefore, applicants' argument with factual data has no patentable weight. The same response is also applicable to the argument with respect to Ni in Tanaka '242.